arXiv:1204.5948v11 [gr-qc] 24 Mar 2013

FERMILAB-PUB-12-044-A

Covariant Macroscopic Quantum Geometry

Craig J. Hogan
University of Chicago and Fermilab

A covariant quantum geometry defined by noncommuting position operators is proposed to describe possible new quantum geometrical degrees of freedom of position of massive bodies, excluding all standard particle degrees of freedom. In the rest frame of a body, the algebra of position operators resembles the standard quantum algebra of angular momentum, but with position and a Planckian length ℓ_P in the place of angular momentum and Planck constant $\hbar$. Standard quantum mechanics then leads to a new kind of geometrical uncertainty in transverse position with variance given by $\langle x_\perp^2 \rangle = L\ell_P$ at separation L, and associated fluctuations with timescale $\tau \approx L/c$. To approximate classical locality in the macroscopic limit, position states must be entangled, and fluctuations of neighboring bodies must be correlated, simply by proximity. The number of eigenstates agrees with entropic gravity if $\ell_P = ct_P/\sqrt{4\pi}$, where $ct_P \equiv \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3}$ denotes the standard Planck length. The theory and its physical interpretation can be tested by correlating signals between appropriately configured Michelson interferometers.

INTRODUCTION

The Standard Model of particles and fields is formulated using quantum field theory, based on quantized matter fields embedded in a classical background geometry. The model proposed here develops a complementary approximation, based on classical matter embedded in a quantum geometry. The model cannot describe elementary particles, but may be a better, fully consistent quantum description for the macroscopic position states of massive bodies. Gravitational theory suggests that the geometrical quantum system has a finite information density of one qubit per Planck length squared, $(ct_P)^2 \equiv \hbar G/c^3$. If so, the model here predicts that the uncertainty of quantum geometry leads to a new form of noise detectable in interferometers.

The seemingly simple concept of the position of a body in space and time is surprisingly difficult to pin down precisely. Indeed, no exact reconciliation is known between the different concepts of position in relativity and quantum mechanics[1, 2]. Classical geometry is based on a pre-quantum notion of position: a space-time metric describes intervals between idealized, point-like events on a continuous manifold, with positions labeled by real 4-vectors in some system of coordinates. In quantum mechanics, positions of particles or bodies, like all observables, are defined by interactions and described by operators, and do not have definite values in a general quantum state.[3] Classical geometry is based on the idea of locality, but it can only be measured with quantum processes that do not happen in a definite time or place. There is no physical way to compare the positions of classically defined events— which raises doubts about whether there even is such a thing as a definite time or place.

Quantum field theory— the basis of the Standard Model of particles and fields— provides a practical solution, based on quantization of infinitely extended wave modes in classical space-time. This approximation becomes inconsistent for dynamical geometry on scales smaller than the Planck length; it predicts spontaneous quantum fluctuations into black holes with quantum position indeterminacy larger than their Schwarzschild radius, so the geometry itself must be indeterminate. However, it is self-consistent at low energies, where Planck scale effects are highly suppressed, and is generally used as the low energy limit for string theory and other candidate fundamental theories[4]. Its predictions agree with all experiments on elementary particles.

On the other hand this approach is still incomplete, since does not explain the emergence of classical geometry as an approximate behavior in the macroscopic limit of a quantum system. Classical spatial relationships, including notions of position, direction, and locality, should not simply be assumed, but should be explained as an average behavior of large systems.[5] In principle, the states of the system may include new quantum-geometrical degrees of freedom and forms of quantum position entanglement not possible with quantized fields on a classical background, or even with a quantized dynamical metric.

A simple theory of quantum geometry with these properties is proposed here. *It ignores all standard quantum degrees of freedom*, as well as gravity and the effects of quantum fields. Instead, *it is a quantum theory of position that includes only new geometrical degrees of freedom.* Position is represented as a set of operators with a covariant algebra. Basic quantum mechanical principles then lead to an effective theory that produces a qualitatively new form of quantum indeterminacy of position on macroscopic scales.

The new geometrical degrees of freedom are introduced using a noncommutative quantum algebra of position operators. The commutator differs from previous noncommutative geometries[6]: to preserve covariance, it depends on position and 4-velocity, instead of an introduced auxiliary field. As a result, quantum departures from classicality explicitly (albeit very slightly) depend on the choice of measurement frame. Quantum positions approximate classical ones in the macroscopic limit— locality "emerges" from the quantum system— but a new quantum-geometrical uncertainty leads to a new kind of coherent, transverse quantum fluctuation in macroscopically separated positions.

In contrast to previous effective theories with similar behavior[7], the theory proposed here is fixed just by basic principles of covariance and quantum mechanics, and is not derived from any particular microscopic theory. Although it is connected to new Planckian physics, it is not assumed to apply in this form at the Planck scale; rather, it is a hypothesis, in the form of a quantum mechanical theory, about how attributes of position might depart slightly from classical behavior in the macroscopic limit.

Thought experiments including gravity suggest that states of quantum geometry may be nonlocal and holographic, with a countably finite Planckian information content defined on 2D boundaries, and that gravitation— classical space-time dynamics— may be an emergent statistical behavior of the quantum system.[8–10] The theory here does not extend to curved geometry; in statistical language, it treats only the zero temperature case. Although the geometry is a quantum system, there is no "quantum gravity" in this theory, since curvature degrees of freedom are not quantized. However, it is natural to normalize the theory to agree with the Planckian information content suggested by low-energy gravity. The quantum fluctuations can then be predicted with no free parameters or numerical ambiguity. They are both consistent with current experimental constraints, and detectable with current technology.

The physical quantity identified with the position operator here is the mean position of an assembly of matter, which in keeping with classical use is called a "body". This concept does not have a clear microscopic meaning, but has a clear macroscopic physical interpretation according to the usual meaning of position in the classical limit. The theory here is based on this emergent behavior, rather than a bottoms-up derivation from a fundamental theory. No attempt is made here to relate quantum geometry to a more fundamental theory, such as string theory, apart from the normalization based on holographic ideas. As shown below, the approach taken is self-consistent because the spatial locality used to define the assembly of particles emerges with increasing precision on macroscopic scales.

Unlike familiar quantum mechanical systems, the commutator considered here does not depend on the mass of the body. As shown below, the new geometrical uncertainty dominates over standard quantum-mechanical uncertainty for collections of particles more massive than a few Planck masses. The theory here, which neglects standard quantum mechanical degrees of freedom, serves as a self-consistent approximation for a quantum theory of systems that are both much larger than a Planck length in size, and much larger than a Planck mass in total energy. It cannot serve as a theory of elementary particles, but may be a better approximation than quantum field theory for positional degrees of freedom in macroscopic systems.

This possibility can be tested in experiments. The new effects of geometrical degrees of freedom are too small to detect in particle experiments, but may be accessible via very precise macroscopic position measurements.

THEORY

Requirements for macroscopic quantum geometry

The goal is to write down an effective theory that can describe new quantum-geometrical degrees of freedom. The theory below satisfies a number of nontrivial constraints, summarized here:

1. It must be consistent with what we know about classical geometry. In particular, it must satisfy Lorentz covariance. The approach taken here is to start with an algebra of position operators that transforms in a covariant way, and interpret them as quantum deviations of positions of massive bodies from their classical values.

2. It must be a consistent quantum theory. For example, the operator algebra must satisfy Jacobi identities. The approach taken here is based on a familiar algebra known to have this property.

3. It must be consistent with field theory, to adequate precision. In the approach here, a radial separation operator commutes with position in any direction. Thus, unidirectional plane wave modes in any direction propagate along an effectively classical dimension. For the same reason, a classical causal structure based on light cones can be defined for any observer.

4. The quantum system should have a holographic density of states— that is, the number of geometrical eigenstates in a volume equals the surface area in Planck units. In this case the geometrical states

can be identified with the microstates needed for a thermodynamic formulation of General Relativity, or entropic Newtonian gravity. In the approach here, this requirement fixes the normalization of the noncommutative algebra.

5. The macroscopic limit must be consistent with emergence of approximate locality. As explained below, this requirement is met if position states of nearby bodies are entangled.

6. It must be consistent with current experiments. As it turns out this is true, but not by a large margin: it makes nontrivial new predictions that can be tested.

Covariant Noncommutative Geometry

Suppose that the position of a body in each direction μ is a quantum observable, represented by a self-adjoint operator x_μ. The commutators of these operators represent the quantum deviations of a body from a classical trajectory. The body is assumed to be massive enough that we ignore the conventional position commutators—the usual quantum effects associated with its motion. To describe the quantum geometry, we posit the following commutators relating positions in different directions:

$$[x_\mu, x_\nu] = x^\kappa U^\lambda \epsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda} i\ell_P, \qquad (1)$$

where indices $\mu, \nu, \kappa, \lambda$ run from 0 to 3 with the usual summation convention, $U^\lambda \equiv \dot{x}^\lambda / c\sqrt{\dot{x}_\alpha \dot{x}^\alpha}$ represents an operator for the dimensionless 4-velocity of the body (normalized to preserve reparametrization invariance, where $\dot{x} \equiv \partial x/\partial\tau$ and τ denotes proper time), and $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\kappa}$ is the antisymmetric 4-tensor.

The departure of positions from classical behavior—the commutator— depends on position and 4-velocity in a specific and unusual way. The explicit form of dependence adopted in Eq.(1) on position and velocity is driven by the requirement of covariance. The quantum commutator of two vectors requires two antisymmetric indices that must be matched by indices on the right side. Thus we require a nonvanishing antisymmetric tensor, which in four dimensions has four indices, $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\kappa}$. Two of its antisymmetric indices match those of the noncommuting positions. The other two must contract with two different vectors to avoid vanishing. The unique geometrically defined options are the 4-velocity and position of the body being measured.

In the limit $\ell_P \to 0$, the commutator vanishes, and positions in different spatial directions behave independently and classically. It is interesting to ask what happens if the scale ℓ_P is not zero, in particular if it is of order the Planck length, $\ell_P \approx ct_P$. The information density of geometrical states then agrees with holographic entropy bounds for gravitating systems, as explained below.

Equation (1) is manifestly covariant: the two sides transform in the same way under the homogeneous Lorentz group, as a direct product of vectors. The algebra of the quantum position operators respects the transformation properties of corresponding coordinates in an emergent classical Minkowski space-time, in a limit where the operators are interpreted as the usual space-time coordinates. The theory itself thus defines no preferred direction in space.

On the other hand, Eq. (1) is not translation invariant. The commutator does depend on the position and 4-velocity of the body being measured, or equivalently, on the origin and rest frame of the coordinate system. We interpret this to mean that *the commutator describes a quantum relationship between world lines that depends on their relative positions and velocities, but not on any other properties of the bodies being compared.* The Hilbert space of quantum geometry depends on a causal structure defined by a choice of timelike trajectory[5], and the quantum-geometrical position state is defined in relation to a particular world line, the origin of the coordinates. Unlike a classical geometry, which is defined independently of any observer, the state of a quantum geometry and indeed the definition of position are shaped by this choice, so they cannot obey translation invariance. As discussed below, if ℓ_P is of the order of the Planck length, this subtle new quantum effect would have escaped detection.

Radial Separation Eigenstates

The physical interpretation of Eq.(1) is most straightforward in the rest frame of the body. In that frame, the 4-velocity is $U^\lambda = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ so the non-vanishing terms of Eq. (1) are those multiplied by $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda}$ with $\lambda = 0$. The remaining terms describe a noncommutative geometry in three dimensions:

$$[x_i, x_j] = x_k \epsilon_{ijk} i\ell_P, \qquad (2)$$

where indices i, j, k now run from 1 to 3, and the operators x_i correspond to positions at a single time, in the rest frame of the body. Eq. (2) describes a quantum-geometrical relationship between positions of two trajectories (or massive bodies) that have proper 3-separation x_k, and whose world lines have the same 4-velocity.

The algebra in Eq. (2) defines a consistent quantum theory; indeed, it is the same as the standard quantum description of angular momentum, albeit in an unconventional physical application. Here, position in units of a fundamental length ℓ_P takes the place usually assigned to angular momentum in units of $\hbar$. The algebra itself is of course well known[11], and leads to precise results on the properties of the quantum-geometrical system.

For example, the operators obey the Jacobi identities

$$[x_i, [x_j, x_k]] + [x_k, [x_i, x_j]] + [x_j, [x_k, x_i]] = 0, \qquad (3)$$

which shows that in the non-relativistic limit (Eq. 2), the effective quantum theory is self-consistent. Note that this conclusion does not require positing new quantum-geometrical commutators for the operators $\dot{x}_\mu$, or knowing the Hamiltonian for the system. Usually the quantum conditions (Eq. 2) are derived from a correspondence principle with classical Poisson brackets; here, they are derived from general considerations of covariance, since there is no classical system corresponding to the quantum geometrical degrees of freedom. As estimated below, in laboratory applications on a scale of $\approx 10^{36}\ell_P$, the quantum geometrical transverse positions vary extremely slowly (an equivalent of about $10^{-18}c$), so the nonrelativistic approximation is excellent.

Consider an operator

$$|x|^2 \equiv x_i x_i, \tag{4}$$

corresponding to the squared modulus of separation, analogous to the square of total angular momentum. In the same way that total angular momentum commutes with all of its components, the radial separation between trajectories behaves classically:

$$[|x|^2, x_i] = 0, \tag{5}$$

so that emergent causal structure, with light cones defined by $|x|^2$, has no quantum uncertainty. For any single direction— for example, a direction of a plane wave mode in field theory— the system behaves classically. It is only in comparison of positions in transverse directions that new quantum-geometric effects appear.

Eigenstates and Uncertainty

A body can be in a state of definite radial separation, and also definite position in any single direction. However, a body cannot be in a definite position state in more than one direction, and this leads to a new kind of uncertainty that can also be understood from the angular momentum algebra. If a system is in a state of definite angular momentum in one direction, the components of angular momentum in the transverse directions are indeterminate. Similarly, if a body is in a state of definite separation in one direction, the position components in transverse directions are indeterminate— in the macroscopic limit, very slightly so.

We adapt conventional notation used for angular momentum. Let l denote positive integers corresponding to the quantum numbers of radial separation, analogous to total angular momentum. The separation operator takes discrete eigenvalues:

$$|x|^2|l\rangle = l(l+1)\ell_P^2|l\rangle. \tag{6}$$

We denote the eigenvalue corresponding to classical separation by $L \equiv \sqrt{l(l+1)}\ell_P$.

Now consider projections of the operator x_i. Let l_i denote the eigenvalues of position in direction i. In a state $|l\rangle$ of separation number l, the position operator x_i can have eigenvalues in units of ℓ_P,

$$l_i = l, l-1, \dots, -l, \tag{7}$$

giving $2l+1$ possible values. In an eigenstate with a definite value of position in direction i,

$$x_i|l, l_i\rangle = l_i \ell_P |l, l_i\rangle. \tag{8}$$

Define raising and lowering operators for each direction:

$$x_{3\pm} \equiv x_1 \pm i x_2, \tag{9}$$

with equivalent expressions for cyclic permutations of the indices. These can be used to show[11] that for any i,

$$|x|^2 = x_{i+}x_{i-} + x_i^2 + x_i = x_{i-}x_{i+} - x_i^2 + x_i. \tag{10}$$

Direct calculation (e.g., ref.[11]) then leads to the following product of amplitudes for measurements of either of the transverse components x_j, with $j \neq i$:

$$\langle l_i|x_j|l_i-1\rangle\langle l_i-1|x_j|l_i\rangle = (l+l_i)(l-l_i+1)\ell_P^2/2, \tag{11}$$

again for any i.

The left side of equation (11) can be interpreted as the expected value for the operator

$$x_j|l_i-1\rangle\langle l_i-1|x_j \tag{12}$$

for components with $j \neq i$, in a state $|l_i\rangle$ of definite x_i. For $l >> 1$ and $l_i \approx l$, this corresponds to the expected variance in components of position transverse to separation:

$$\langle x_j|l_i-1\rangle\langle l_i-1|x_j\rangle \to \langle x_j^2\rangle. \tag{13}$$

We conclude that position in any direction transverse to separation is indeterminate, with a variance given by the right hand side of Eq. (11) in the limit of $l >> 1$:

$$\langle x_\perp^2\rangle \equiv \langle x_j^2\rangle = L\ell_P. \tag{14}$$

Transverse positions show the same kind of quantum indeterminacy as transverse components of angular momentum in the nearly-classical, large-angular-momentum limit. The physical analog is measurement of a component transverse to the angular momentum vector; such a measurement reveals a superposition of transverse direction states, with a range of eigenvalues. In our application, position can similarly have a definite value in the radial direction— corresponding to its classical value— but is indeterminate in the transverse directions. The new quantum-geometrical uncertainty increases with separation, and at macroscopic separations, it is much larger than ℓ_P.

As usual in quantum mechanics, the state can be represented by a wave function, and the commutator leads to an uncertainty relation between the variances of the wave functions of the conjugate variables. It can be derived from Eq.(2) in the usual way, although the conjugate variables are now positions in different directions, instead of angular momentum components in different directions. In the rest frame, the uncertainty relations for a body at positions x_k are

$$\Delta x_i \Delta x_j \geq |x_k \epsilon_{ijk}| \ell_P/2, \tag{15}$$

where $\Delta x_i = \langle |x_i - \bar{x}_i|^2 \rangle^{1/2}$ represents the spread of the wave function in each direction about the expected (classical) position $\bar{x}_i$. Note that this result is consistent with, but less constraining than Eq. (14), which does not allow uncertainty to be squeezed out of one transverse direction and into the other.

Number of eigenstates

The geometrical position states have a discrete spectrum. The number of position eigenstates within a 3-sphere of radius R can be counted in the same way as discrete angular momentum eigenstates, as follows.

Recall that radial position has discrete quantum numbers l. Using Eq. (6), the number l_R of radial position eigenstates for a radius R is given by $l_R(l_R+1) = (R/\ell_P)^2$. For each of these, from Eq. (7), there are $2l+1$ eigenstates of direction. The total number of quantum position eigenstates in a 3-sphere is then

$$\mathcal{N}_{Q3S}(R) = \sum_{l=1}^{l_R} (2l+1) = l_R(l_R+2) = (R/\ell_P)^2, \tag{16}$$

where the last equality applies in the large l limit. Thus, the number of quantum-geometrical position eigenstates in a volume scales holographically, as the surface area in Planck units, instead of 3-volume, as it does for the eigenstates of a quantized field with a frequency cutoff.

Normalization from Gravity

Although gravity does not enter explicitly into any of the arguments here, it is natural to fix the physical value of ℓ_P by equating the number of geometrical eigenstates with the number of states deduced from thermodynamic arguments applied to gravitational systems. This property is expected for geometrical states in an emergent space-time capable of describing gravity entropically[8, 10]. An exact calibration is possible, because the number of states in a 3-sphere can be counted exactly for both geometry and gravity.

The number of position states for a massive body enclosed in a 3-sphere that entropically reproduces nonrelativistic Newtonian gravity (cf. [10], Eq. 3.10) is given by:

$$\mathcal{N}_{G3S}(R) = 4\pi (R/ct_P)^2, \tag{17}$$

with the usual definition of Planck time, $ct_P \equiv \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3} = 1.616 \times 10^{-35}$m. Note that this is four times larger than the entropy of a black hole event horizon of the same radius.

The quantum-geometrical and gravitational estimates agree, $\mathcal{N}_{Q3S} = \mathcal{N}_{G3S}$, if the numerical value of the effective commutator coefficient ℓ_P is

$$\ell_P = ct_P/\sqrt{4\pi}. \tag{18}$$

If Eq. (18) holds, bodies in the space-time that emerges from the quantum geometry move as described by Newtonian gravity.

As discussed below, an interesting and attainable experimental goal is to detect or rule out a commutator with this value. From Eq. (14), the theory predicts quantum-geometrical uncertainty in physical units,

$$\langle x_\perp^2 \rangle = Lct_P/\sqrt{4\pi} = (2.135 \times 10^{-18}\text{m})^2 (L/1\text{m}), \tag{19}$$

with no free parameters. Experimental consequences are discussed below.

The numerical value of the coefficient in Eq. (19) is slightly lower (by a factor of $\sqrt{\pi}/4$) than the value previously estimated by a different method, using a wave theory normalized to black hole entropy (Eq. 29 of ref. [7].) The value computed here is better controlled, because the quantum and gravitational numbers both refer to the same physical system, a spherical 3-volume at rest with no curvature.

EMERGENCE OF LOCALITY

The effect of the quantum geometry can be characterized as an uncertainty in angular position. Consider the quantum-geometrical variance in angular position of a body at separation L, from Eq. (14):

$$\langle \Delta\theta^2 \rangle \equiv \langle x_\perp^2 \rangle / L^2 = \ell_P/L. \tag{20}$$

Unlike the position uncertainty, the angular uncertainty decreases with separation. Classical geometry and locality thus emerge as excellent approximations to describe relative positions of trajectories with separations much larger than the Planck length.

For any experimentally accessible scale, the deviation from classicality is fractionally negligible. However, as separations approach the Planck scale, directions become indeterminate. The classical approximation to geometry then breaks down, consistent with the idea of a space-time emerging from a Planckian quantum system. That system does not resemble a traditional quantum-gravitational "space-time foam" with quantum equivalent of strong Planck scale gravity and virtual black holes, inspired by extrapolation of quantum field theory. Instead, space-time positions, curvature and gravity only emerge as statistical behaviors on large scales.

Transverse Fluctuations and Coherence

The uncertainty describes properties of a wave function in a stationary state that respects the symmetries of bodies at rest in Minkowski space. As usual, the wave function itself is not observed in any physical measurement, since it describes a superposition of histories and position states. Instead, the spread of the wave function manifests as random results, or noise, in a time series of nonlocal position measurements in more than one direction. The effect of the uncertainty on measurements of position is constrained by requiring the system to approach standard physics in the macroscopic limit.

The state described by the geometrical wave function cannot independently describe the trajectories of individual particles, since that would result in unacceptable, locally measurable fluctuations dependent on an arbitrary choice of origin for the coordinate system. However, the uncertainty is consistent with emergence of locality on large scales, if the quantum-geometrical deviations from a classical trajectory are entangled coherently and nonlocally, so that all matter in a small region (where "small" means much smaller than L) shares approximately the same deviation $x_i - \bar{x}_i$ in an actual position measurement. Colloquially, we can say that matter which is close together, moves together. In a Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, one would say: *The geometry "collapses" into the same state for all events on the same null surfaces defined by the causal diamond of the observer.* This interpretation is consistent with the classical approximations used to interpret Eqs. (1): the quantum operators refer to a collective position and 4-velocity of an arbitrary assembly of mass-energy in a compact region of space, and average over time to the mean classical space-time position, as long as the region is much smaller than L.

With this interpretation, the positional quantum states of bodies in emergent space-time possess a new kind of nonlocal coherence not describable by states of standard quantum theory in classical space-time. The coherent entanglement of geometrical position states creates a new correlation in the mean positions of otherwise separate bodies— including an in-common, coherent quantum-geometrical deviation from their classical trajectories. Nonlocal entanglement of position states is perhaps the strangest feature of this quantum geometry, but appears to be required in order that the number of position states not exceed the holographic gravitational bound. Because of the coherence, neighboring elements of an apparatus fluctuate together, even if there is no physical connection between them apart from relative proximity.

The decoherence of position states in space and time— the deviation from noiseless classical behavior— is given by the uncertainty amplitude in Eq. (14), where L corresponds to the separation of the elements and L/c the timescale of the variation. Put another way, the direction to a distant body fluctuates slowly about its classical value with variance given in Eq. (20). To detect the effect, an apparatus must compare positions of compact bodies over an extended region of space in more than one direction, over a duration comparable to its size. Over longer durations, the fluctuations are smaller, as positions average to their classical values.

EXPERIMENTAL TESTS

Particle Experiments

The purely transverse character implies zero quantum-geometrical uncertainty— equivalent to a classical geometry— for measurements of position that involve interactions with particles propagating in only a single direction. This behavior is different from fluctuations or dispersion caused by gravitational waves or quantized-metric fluctuations. It applies even over cosmic distances, so the theory is unconstrained by studies of light from distant sources that constrain some forms of Planck-scale Lorentz invariance violation.[12, 13]

The predicted fluctuations[7], while much larger than the Planck length, are too small to detect with laboratory position measurements of small numbers of atoms or molecules. Indeed, standard quantum uncertainty dominates geometrical uncertainty for small masses. The standard quantum limit [14] for the variance in a body's position difference measured at two times separated by a duration τ,

$$\Delta x_{SQL}^2 \equiv \langle (x(t) - x(t+\tau))^2 \rangle \geq 2\hbar\tau/m, \tag{21}$$

is greater than the quantum-geometrical position variance (Eq. 19) at separation $|x| = c\tau$ if the mass m of a body satisfies $m < 4\sqrt{\pi} m_P$, where $m_P \equiv \hbar/c^2 t_P = 2.176 \times 10^{-5}$g denotes the Planck mass.

Quantum-geometrical uncertainty is therefore negligible on the mass scale of Standard Model particles ($< 10^{-16} m_P$), which accounts for why classical space-time is such a good approximation for systems involving small numbers of particles, and why standard theory agrees so well with precision tests in microscopic experiments. The space-time even in a single $\approx$ TeV^4 collision volume encompasses $\approx 10^{32}$ degrees of freedom, and detectors do not have sufficient precision to detect the predicted tiny deviations from the phase space of quantized field modes in a classical geometry.

Interferometry

Detection of the quantum-geometrical uncertainty requires a nonlocal, bidirectional experiment, that measures relative positions of bodies on at least three widely separated world lines, with time sampling comparable to their separation. It can best be distinguished from other noise sources by measuring mean positions of large assemblies of particles, that is, massive bodies such as mirrors.

The most promising experimental test comes from predicted noise in interferometer signals. A Michelson interferometer creates a coherent state of many photons spatially extended along two macroscopic arms.[14] The measured signal from the interfered light depends on positions of three mirrors, a beamsplitter and two end mirrors, at three different times separated by the arm length L. The world lines of the mirrors are widely separated in two directions, so quantum-geometrical position uncertainty of the beamsplitter relative to the end mirrors leads to noise, or fluctuations in the signal. Position fluctuations with variance given in Eq. (19), and timescale $\tau \approx L/c$, create noise with calculable statistical properties.[7] In a standard Michelson interferometer, the power spectral density of position noise in conventional units (variance of fractional arm length difference fluctuation per frequency interval), at frequencies low compared with c/L, is given approximately by the Planck time:

$$h^2 \approx \frac{\langle \Delta x_\perp^2 \rangle}{cL} = t_P/\sqrt{4\pi} = (1.23 \times 10^{-22}\mathrm{Hz}^{-1/2})^2. \quad (22)$$

Care must be taken in using quoted limits, since the quantum-geometry effect on the signal depends on the interferometer layout in ways that significantly differ from gravitational wave response.[7] However, it is clear that existing interferometers[15] already rule out such fluctuations for commutators significantly larger than the Planck scale.

If two separate interferometers have mirrors in nearly the same positions, separated by much less than L, their geometrical position states are entangled, so fluctuations in their signals are correlated in a known way[7], depending only on the experimental configuration. An experiment based on this specific signature, currently under construction at Fermilab,[16] is designed to achieve the required Planckian sensitivity to detect the fluctuations, or to convincingly rule them out. The theory here suggests that the outcome of this experiment could shed light on the emergent origin of classical locality and gravity from a Planck scale theory.

I am grateful to D. Berman, A. Chou, D. Gross, S. Meyer, J. Schwarz, C. Stoughton, and especially M. Perry, for useful discussions, and for the hospitality of the Aspen Center for Physics, which is supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. PHY-1066293. This work was supported by the Department of Energy at Fermilab under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359.

[1] E. P. Wigner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 255 (1957)
[2] H. Salecker & E. P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **109**, 571 (1958)
[3] W. H. Zurek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 715 (2003)
[4] S. Hossenfelder, arXiv:1203.6191 [gr-qc].
[5] T. Banks, arXiv:1109.2435 [hep-th].
[6] A. Connes, "Noncommutative Geometry", San Diego: Academic Press (1994)
[7] C. J. Hogan, Phys. Rev. D 85, 064007 (2012)
[8] T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1260 (1995)
[9] R. Bousso, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 825 (2002)
[10] E. P. Verlinde, JHEP **1104**, 029 (2011)
[11] L. D. Landau & E. M. Lifshitz, "Quantum Mechanics: Non-Relativistic Theory", 3rd ed., Oxford: Pergamon (1977), secs. 26 & 27
[12] A. A. Abdo et al., Nature **462**, 331-334, (2009)
[13] P. Laurent, D. Gotz, P. Binetruy, S. Covino and A. Fernandez-Soto, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 121301 (2011)
[14] C. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 75 (1980)
[15] LIGO Scientific Collaboration, Nature Physics **7**, 962 (2011)
[16] http://holometer.fnal.gov